

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/762,127	NAGAISHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leslie Wong	2164	

All Participants:
Status of Application: Allowance

 (1) Leslie Wong.

(3) _____.

 (2) Mr. Michael T. Gabrik.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 November 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

51-66, Specification and Abstract

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner contacted Applicant's representative to request pointing out supports for the last limitation of claim 1 in the Specification, the representative indicated that although the Specification does not describe the mentioned limitation word for word as recited in the claim; the reader should be able to understand that its content is the same with the claimed limitation from reading the disclosure. Further, Examiner requested that the preamble for claims 51-62 and 64-66 should be changed from "device-readable medium" to "computer-readable storage medium" as suggested by a member of the 101 panel. The representative agreed to do so. Also, Examiner indicated that Abstract does not conform the format required by the PTO. The representative authorized the Examiner to enter to above changes via an Examiner's Amendments.